

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 were pending in the application. The final office action, dated November 5, 2009, rejects all pending claims 1-24.

This paper amends claims 1, 11, 17, and 21-23. Support for the amendments to s claims 1, 11, 17, and 21 can be found in paragraphs [0016] and [0019]. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 21-23, and 25-28 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 11, 17, and 21-23 were amended in this paper solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 11, 17, and 21-23 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application.

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101**

The Office Action rejects Claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 21-24 to be directed to a computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium, and amends the specification to show support more expressly in the specification for a computer readable storage medium. A storage medium comprises hardware structure. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

### **Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claim 22 and 23 for consecutively stating “for” twice. Applicant has amended claims 22 and 23 to eliminate the duplicate word, and submits that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. (U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0014488) in view of von Kaenel (US Publication No. 2004/0117358). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the claims as now amended.

Independent claim 1 now recites, in pertinent part, integrating a third-party system with an online meeting system. A service provider interface (SPI) is provided. The SPI defines a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system. One of the procedures of the SPI is implemented in a third-party software module of the third-party system. The third-party software module is installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application. The third-party software module performs, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system.

The Office Action acknowledges that “Dalal does not specifically teach that the software module is a third party software module of a third-party system, the third-party software module perform[sic] a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system.” To this, the applicant adds that Dalal does not teach or suggest “installing the third party software module as a plug-in to the meeting services application”, as now set forth in the applicant’s claims.

The secondary reference, von Kaenel teaches a system for integrating enterprise data with third-party data. According to paragraph [0265]:

The enterprise integration technology 740 also provides the ability to interact with and retrieve data from third party applications using various application programming interfaces (API) exposed by third party applications and makes the data available to the client systems of the data center.

Von Kaenel's third-party applications, however, are not the equivalent of the applicant's third-party software module, which, as now claimed, is installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application. Although von Kaenel may suggest interaction between enterprise applications and third-party applications -- for purposes of integrating enterprise and third-party data -- von Kaenel does not suggest installing any of such third-party applications as a plug-in to any given enterprise application. Therefore, Dalal and von Kaenel, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "installing the third party software module as a plug-in to the meeting services application", as now set forth in the applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Each of the other independent claims 11, 17 and 21 has been amended to recite claim language similar to that of independent claim 1 and is patentable for at least those reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims, and are patentable for at least those reasons presented above in connection with the particular independent claim from which each depends. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection against these claims also be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal and von Kaenel in view of Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,708), and claims 7 and 15 over Dalal and von Kaenel in view of Nakajima (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,510). Applicant respectfully traverses these

rejections because each of the claims 4, 7, and 15 depends from an allowable independent claim, and is patentable for at least this reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits that this paper provides a response for all pending claims. Any absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, or to any taking of “official notice” or reliance on “common sense”, however, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, comment, taking of “official notice”, or reliance on “common sense”. In addition, because the arguments made above are not exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims before and after any amendment thereof that have not been expressed.

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the applicant’s representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-0932.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2010  
Reg. No. 41,274

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005  
Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932

/Michael A. Rodriguez/  
Michael A. Rodriguez  
Attorney for applicant  
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP  
5 Mount Royal Avenue  
Marlborough, MA 01752